

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Attorney Docket No. A34237 MBHB Case No. 04-941-A

In re the Application of:)	
Gye-Chool Lee)	
) Examiner: Hong Sol Cho	
Serial No.: 09/843,354)	
) Group Art Unit: 2662	
Filed: April 26, 2001)	
) Confirmation No. 8507	
For: METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING)	
BTS AND BSC IN IMT-2000)	
SYSTEM)	
Mail Stop Issue Fee		
Commissioner for Patents		
P.O. Box 1450		
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450		

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Dear Sir:

In regard to the above identified application,

- 1. I am transmitting herewith the attached:
 - a) Issue Fee Transmittal Form Form PTOL 85 Part B;
 - b) Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets;
 - c) Replacement Drawing Sheets;
 - d) Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance;
 - e) Check; and
 - f) Return receipt postcard.
- 2. With respect to fees:
 - a) A check for \$1,700.00 is enclosed to pay the Issue and Publication fees.
 - b) Please charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account, No. 13-2490.
- 3. CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this Transmittal Letter and the paper, as described in paragraph 1 hereinabove, are being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 22, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2005

By: David L. Ciesielski

Reg. No. 57,432

OFE 403

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Attorney Docket No. A34237 MBHB Case No. 04-941-A

In re the Application of:)
)
Gye-Chool Lee)
) Examiner: Hong Sol Cho
Serial No.: 09/843,354)
) Group Art Unit: 2662
Filed: April 26, 2001)
-) Confirmation No. 8507
For: METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING)
BTS AND BSC IN IMT-2000)
SYSTEM)

SUBMISSION OF REPLACMENT DRAWING SHEETS

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

We have now procured and enclose herewith replacement drawing sheets for Figures 3 and 5 (2 sheets) and annotated drawing sheets (2 sheets) showing the changes made to Figures 3 and 5, for the above-identified application. Figures 3 and 5 have been redrawn to correct a typographical error.

Prompt consideration of this submission is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2005

By: David L. Ciesielski

Registration No. 57,432

Telephone: (312) 913-0001 Facsimile: (312) 913-0002



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Attorney Docket No. A34237 MBHB Case No. 04-941-A

In re t	he Application of:)	
)	
Gye-Chool Lee)		
)	Examiner: Hong Sol Cho
Serial	No.: 09/843,354)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2662
Filed:	April 26, 2001)	-
	•)	Confirmation No. 8507
For:	METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING)	
]	BTS AND BSC IN IMT-2000)	
i	SYSTEM)	

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

The Applicant expresses appreciation for the allowance of the claims in the above-identified application. The Applicant notes the Examiner's Reasons for Allowance listed on a Notice of Allowability mailed November 5, 2004, but further comments that the art of record, alone and in combination, fails to show, teach or suggest the entirety of each combination of steps and/or structure recited by each of the allowed claims of the present invention.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims. In light of the original disclosure, previous Office Actions and responses, however, the Applicant believes that the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear. The Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. The Applicant believes that the statement of reasons for allowance in this case is improper as it merely paraphrases or copies limitations of the claims into the reasons for allowance. While the Applicant

believes that the claims are allowable, the Applicant does not acquiesce that patentability resides in the features, as explicitly set forth in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: November 22, 2005

By:

David L. Ciesielski Reg. No. 57,432